

REMARKS

Claim Status

Claims 10-20 are pending. Claims 10-20 are rejected. Claims 10-12 are amended. No new matter is added by way of these amendments.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 10-20 as being unpatentable over Setogawa (US Patent 6,469,718), Watkins (US Patent 6,728,477) and DeCarmo (US Patent 6,415,101) in view of Kim (US Patent 5,917,781).

With respect to independent claims 10 and 11, the Examiner indicates that, “Setogawa, Watkins, and DeCarmo do not specifically disclose the concurrent output of the first audio portion and the second audio portion.” However, Kim teaches that multiple or plural audio channels can be outputted concurrently. The Applicant respectfully argues that Kim does not teach the same type of concurrent output of multiple audio channels as taught by the present invention.

In Kim, the multiple audio channels being outputted concurrently come from the *same* audio/video source. In Fig. 2, a single audio/video source (element 201) is sent to multiple audio decoders (elements 204-1 and 204-2). The multiple audio channels have the *same content* and merely differ in the languages spoken (please see Kim, col. 3 ln. 20-22). The multiple audio channels are all associated with the same video track.

In contrast, with the present application, the audio/video datastream comprises multiple and *different* audio/video programs each of which comprises a video portion and an audio portion, and that audio portion is *associated only with* the video portion within the same

audio/video program that differs from the content of the audio portion from another audio/video programs (not merely the translation of the same content into different languages).

Independent claims 10 and 11 have been amended to clarify this difference between the present application and Kim. Dependent claim 12 has been amended to reflect the changes made to independent claim 11.

Because Kim does not teach the same type of concurrent output for multiple audio portions, it would not be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Setogawa, Watkins, DeCarmo, and Kim to obtain every element disclosed in amended independent claims 10 and 11. In addition, DeCarmo specifically precludes the capability of playing the audio portions of more than one presentation at a time (please see DeCarmo col, 8 ln. 1-6). Therefore, independent claims 10 and 11 are believed to be patentable over Setogawa, Watkins, DeCarmo, and Kim. Dependent claims 12-20 are believed to be patentable over Setogawa, Watkins, DeCarmo, and Kim for at least the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are allowable. Should the Examiner believe that a further telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

/Michael J. Ferrazano/
Michael J. Ferrazano
Reg. No. 44,105

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(650) 961-8300